

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

After entry of the present amendment, Claims 1-10, 12-26, 28-41, 43, and 44 are pending in the present application. The present amendment amends Claims 1, 8, 16, 23, 32, and 39 without introduction of new matter;¹ and cancels Claims 11, 27, and 42 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants submit the amendment of Claims 1, 8, 16, 23, 32, and 39 does not require further search or consideration.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-4, 16-19 and 32-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,766,454 to Riggins; Claims 5-13, 20-23, 25-27, and 36-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,055,637 to Hudson et al. (hereinafter "Hudson"); Claims 14 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins and Hudson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,138,238 to Scheifler et al.; Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins and Hudson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,670 to Montulli; Claims 24, 28, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins and Hudson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,875,394 to Daly et al.; Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins, Hudson, and Daly in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,189,032 to Susaki et al.; and Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins, Hudson, and Daly in view of Montulli.

Addressing now the rejections of the pending claims as unpatentable over Riggins (i.e., all rejections summarized above), those rejections respectfully traversed.

¹ For support, see the previously presented claims; and see Applicant's specification, page 9, lines 18-27.

Though they are different in scope, each of the amended independent claims recites an electronic badge including a password; and recites structure or steps to authorize transmission of the electronic badge to a visitor's computer in response to authentication of the password.

The outstanding Office Action cites Riggins' authentication applet as teaching the claimed electronic badge including a password. More particularly, the Office Action cites Riggins' authentication applet as teaching an electronic badge including a password for firewall access.² Even assuming *arguendo* that Riggins' authentication applet includes a password for firewall access, the amended independent claims recite an electronic badge including a password for transmission of the electronic badge. Thus, the cited password of Riggins and the claimed password are different.

Further, Riggins transmits the authentication applet without first authenticating a password for transmission. More particularly, Riggins transmits the authentication applet to a remote terminal. The authentication applet is then used to send an encrypted client response (based on a client password) for user verification.³ On the other hand, the claimed electronic badge is not transmitted to the visitor's computer until after password authentication. Thus, the respective transmissions of Riggins' authentication applet and the claimed electronic badge are different.

Accordingly, for the above-stated reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of all pending claims as unpatentable over Riggins be withdrawn.

Though they are different in scope, each of dependent Claims 8, 23, and 39 further recites "a web server that issues said electronic badge in response to said authorization" for transmission. Riggins discloses a global server 920 that forwards the authentication applet to a remote terminal 905. However, the authentication applet does not include a password for

² See Office Action, 6/21/2005, page 2.


³ Riggins, col. 2, lines 35-54.

transmission of the applet. Further, the authentication applet is sent to a remote terminal before the user password is authenticated.⁴

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Raymond F. Cardillo
Registration No. 40,440

I:\ATTY\STD\19's\197593US\197593US.AM.062105.DOC

⁴ Riggins, col. 13, lines ??.